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1. Introduction

This paper claims that absolutive case, that is an abstract case assigned to the intransitive subject (S) and transitive object (O) does not exist. Instead, ergative-absolutive languages fall into two classes. In one class, which I illustrate with Georgian (South Caucasian; data from Harris 1981, Hewitt 1987), “absolutive” is abstract nominative case assigned by T to S and O (cf inter alia Murasugi 1992, Bittner 1994, Bittner & Hale 1996a,b, Ura 2001). In the other class, which I illustrate with Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan, South-West, Ngarga), Niuean (Austronesian, Polynesian, Tongic; data from Massam to appear, Seiter 1980), and Enga (Trans-New Guinea, West-Central; data from Lang 1973, Li & Lang 1979, van Valin 1981), T assigns abstract nominative case to S and v assigns abstract accusative case to O; since these languages lack nominative and accusative case morphology, both nominative and accusative are realized as a morphological default = “absolutive”. I follow Woolford (1997), among others, in claiming that ergative is inherent case, licensed by v.

The proposed absolutive as morphological default languages require that the traditional distinction between abstract and morphological case must be maintained (contra for example Marantz 1991, and more recently Bobaljik 2005). Although the distinction between morphological and abstract case is standardly assumed for nominative-accusative languages (English, for example), the relevance of this distinction has not been pursued for ergative-absolutive languages; instead, previous analyses assume that the syntax must assign the same case to S and O (see Levin & Massam 1985, Bok-Bennema 1991, Murasugi 1992, Bobaljik 1993, Bittner 1994, Bittner & Hale 1996a,b, Ura 2001, inter alia). I argue that this has seriously undermined efforts to understand ergative-absolutive languages, in particular the absolutive as morphological default languages. Specifically, I claim that abstract case determined in the syntax is realized in the morphology according to the Elsewhere Principle (Pāṇini, Kiparsky 1973, Halle 1997).

Section 2 provides evidence for the analysis from nonfinite clauses, other DP objects, and agreement. Section 3 provides additional evidence for the necessity of distinguishing morphological from abstract case in ergative-absolutive languages, examining case mismatch patterns in three Pama-Nyungan languages. Section 4 discusses the localization of the distinction between the two types of ergative-absolutive languages.

2. Absolutive as Nominative versus as Morphological Default

2.1 Predictions for Nonfinite Clauses

In some languages, nominative case is assigned by both finite and nonfinite T (European Portuguese). In many other languages, however, abstract nominative case is dependent on finite T. Consider the predictions for ergative-absolutive languages in which nominative case is dependent on finite T. In an absolutive as nominative language, both absolutive case on S and absolutive case on O are nominative case licensed

---

1 Thank you to Noam Chomsky, Ken Hale, Irene Heim, Sabine Iatridou, Mary Laughrren, Jason Merchant, Andrew Nevins, Charles Yang, the audience at the Ergativity Workshop (University of Toronto, October 2002), the audiences at WCCFL (2005) and the Penn Linguistics Colloquium (2005), and the audiences at the linguistic colloquia at New York University (2003), University of Connecticut (2003), McGill University (2003), Cornell University (2004), University of Delaware (2005) for comments and discussion on sections of this work. Thank you to Ken Hale, Mary Laughrren, Helen Napurrurla Morton, Bess Nungarrayi Price, Theresa Napurrurla Ross, and Christine Nungarrayi Spencer for teaching me about the Warlpiri language. Glosses in some examples have been regularized for clarity. In Pama-Nyungan language examples, rC indicates a retroflex consonant, Ch indicates a dental consonant, Cy indicates a palatal consonant, ng is the velar nasal.

by finite $T$. Thus, neither will be available in nonfinite clauses. In an absolutive as morphological default language, in contrast, only absolutive case on $S$ is abstract nominative case licensed by finite $T$; absolutive case on $O$ is abstract nominative case licensed by $v$. Therefore, I predict that absolutive case on $S$ be unavailable in nonfinite clauses, whereas absolutive case on $O$ remains available in nonfinite clauses.

Let us first consider the absolutive as morphological default languages. The prediction is borne out in Warlpiri. In Warlpiri, Intransitive subjects cannot bear absolutive.\(^2\) Instead, intransitive subjects bear dative:

   child 1sg-POSS-3pl.SUBJ hit-PAST [I-DAT sleep-lie-NONFIN-OBVC]
   “They hit my child, while I was asleep.”

In contrast, transitive objects uniformly bear absolutive, and may not bear dative:

   [karnta-patu-ku/karnta-patu-rlu miyi/*miyi-ku purra-nja-puru.]
   [woman-PAUC-DAT/woman-PAUC-ERG food.ABS/#food-DAT cook-NONFIN-TEMPC]
   “The men are mustering cattle while the women are cooking the food.”

Transitive subjects (A) may bear either ergative or dative:

   child-PASTIMPF play-stand-PAST [mother-POSS-ERG dig-NONFIN-OBVC]
   “The child was playing, while his mother was digging (for something).” (Laughren 1989:[44a])
   give-NONFIN-OBVC]
   “The girl is building a fire, while the woman is giving food to the baby.” (Hale 1982:[139b])

This pattern is exactly as predicted. In addition, dative case is available on $A$ and $S$ because nonfinite clauses in Warlpiri are nominalized (Simpson 1991; for example nonfinite verbs undergo both verbal and nominal reduplication patterns, and bear case suffixes), and the subjects of nominals receive dative case:

4. [Karnta-ku jaja-ngku] ka yunpa-mi
   [woman-DAT maternal.grandmother-ERG] PRESIMPF sing-NPAST
   “The woman’s grandmother is singing” (Laughren 2001, pc)

Like Warlpiri, Enga exhibits a distinction between the licensing of absolutive on $S$ and absolutive on $O$ in nonfinite clauses. Absolutive case is available for $O$ in nonfinite clauses in Enga:

5. akáli dokó-mé [dokosáa dokó kánj-a-nya] más-i-á.
   man DET-ERG [doctor DET.ABS see-INF-DESID] think-PAST-3sg.SUBJ
   “The man wanted to see the doctor” (L&L 319)

However, absolutive is not available for $S$. To express an overt $S$, a finite complement clause must be used:

6. namba-mé [émba Wápaka pú-p-í lá-o] mási-ly-o
   I-ERG [you.ABS Wabag go-PAST-2sg utter-COMP] think-PRES-1sg
   “I want you to go to Wabag” (L&L 317)

The prediction cannot be tested for in Niuean. In Niuean, nominative case isn’t dependent on the finiteness of $T$; all cases are available in nonfinite (“subjunctive”) clauses:

---

\(^2\)In a corpus of 80 000 sentences, I found no such examples. Simpson (1991:107) reports that rare examples are found, but that such examples are judged ungrammatical.
(7) a. Kua kamata [ke hala te tama e akau] 
   PERF begin [SBJV cut ERG child ABS tree] 
   “The child has begun to cut down the tree” (M [21])

   b. Maeke [ke nofo a Pita i Tuapa] 
   possible [SBJV stay ABS Pita at Tuapa] 
   “Pita can stay at Tuapa” (M [19])

Turning to Georgian, an absolutive as nominative language, we predict that if not all cases are available in nonfinite clauses, neither absolutive on S nor absolutive on O will be available. This prediction is borne out. In Georgian, there are two relevant nonfinite verb forms: the nominalized verb (traditionally termed the “masdar”), and the infinitive (traditionally termed the “future participle in adverbial case”). The nominalized verb does not allow absolutive, either on S or O. Instead, S and O are marked genitive, while A appears as the complement of a postposition:

(8) a. [(monadir-is mier) datv-is mok’vla am t’qeši] ak’rdzalulìa 
   [(hunter-GEN by) bear-GEN killing.NOM this woods.in] forbidden.it.is.I.2 
   “Killing bears in this woods is forbidden”

   b. [tamad-is damtknareba suprave] uzrdelobaa 
   [tamada-GEN yawning.NOM table.on] rudeness.it.is.I.2 
   “It is rude for the tamada to yawn at the table” (H 157-158)

Thus, the nominalized verb involves nominalization of the verb, which then combines with its arguments as a noun rather than a verb. This is in contrast to Warlpiri, in which nominalization at the verb phrase level, after the verb has combines with O (and optionally A) as a verb. The proposed analysis explains why Georgian cannot have Warlpiri-style nominalization at the verb phrase level: this would leave O without abstract case, since O is dependent on finite T for case.

Similar patterns obtain for the infinitive, which is used for purpose clauses with PRO subjects. Again, the object cannot appear with absolutive case, and instead must be marked as genitive:

(9) c’avedi t’qeši [datv-is mosak’lavad] 
   I.went.II.2 woods.in [bear-GEN to.kill] 
   “I went into the woods to kill a bear” (H 155)

2.2 Predictions for Other DPs

The analysis also predicts a distinction between absolutive as nominative and absolutive as morphological default languages with respect to other DPs in the clause. In absolutive as nominative languages, absolutive is nominative case licensed by T and therefore limited one DP in a clause, either S or O. In absolutive as morphological default languages, on the other hand, any DP bearing an abstract case feature that lacks a distinct morphological realization will be realized as the morphological default, hence absolutive. Here we consider specifically objects of postpositions and applicative objects (including the double object construction).

In Enga, the objects of postpositions bear “absolutive”, as do the objects in the double object construction:

(10) akáli dokó-mé [énda kandaó] pií le-ly-á-mo 
    man DET-ERG [woman.ABS toward] word.ABS say-PRES-3sg.SUBJ-SP 
    “The man is telling something to the woman” (L&L 318)

(11) namba-mé énda dóko mend dóko mai-y-ó 
    I-ERG woman DET.ABS pig DET.ABS give-PAST-1sg.SUBJ 
    “I gave the pig to the woman” (L&L 312)
Similarly in Niuean, the object of (benefactive, comitative, instrumental) prepositions appear in “Absolutive”, as do applicative objects.3

(12) a. Ne tohitohi a Sione [aki e pene] PST writing ABS Sione [with ABS pen]
   “Sione is writing with a pen” (M [8])

   b. Gahua a au [ma e tagata kō] work ABS I [for ABS man that]
   “I work for that man there” (S 36)

(13) Ne ahu aki e ia e akau e tau toa PST slay with ERG he ABS club ABS PL hero
   “He slayed the heroes with a club” (M [14])

In Warlpiri, the prediction for applicative and postpositional objects is either borne out or cannot be tested. Double objects and applicative objects in Warlpiri receive dative case, which has a distinct morphological realization (-ku). Warlpiri lacks independent postpositions, however it exhibits “semantic case” morphemes, which may plausibly be considered suffixal postpositions. If so, their objects bear absolutive case: ngurra-kurra “camp.ABS-to”, ngarna-ngurlu “plant.base.ABS-from”.

In Georgian, on the other hand, absolutive is nominative, and therefore limited to either S or O. Objects of postpositions, suffixal or independent, do not bear absolutive case, but instead bear dative, genitive, instrumental, or adverbial case: om-is semdeg “war-GEN after”, kalak-s-ši “city-DA T-in”. The second object in a double object construction receives Dative:

(14) nino-m acvena surateb-i gia-s Nino-ERG she.showed.him.it.II.2 pictures-NOM Gia-DAT
   “Nino showed the pictures to Gia” (H 40)

In addition, Georgian exhibits split ergativity. Examples to this point have been in tense/aspect series II, including the aorist and the optative. In tense/aspect Series I, which includes the present, future, imperfect, conditional present subjunctive, and future subjunctive, ergative is not assigned.

(15) a. glex-i tesavs simind-s Series I peasant-NOM he.sows.it.I.1 corn-DAT
   “The peasant is sowing corn”

   b. glex-ma datesa simind-i Series II peasant-ERG he.sowed.it.II.1 corn-NOM
   “The peasant sowed corn”

Crucially only one absolutive case marked DP is possible in each clause. In Series I, A bears absolutive, so O cannot. Instead, O receives structural dative case from v.

2.3 Interaction with Agreement

Consider the interaction between case marking and agreement in the two types of ergative-absolutive languages. Cutting across the two types is an independent parameter of variation: in some languages, inherent case may trigger agreement, whereas in other languages inherent case may not trigger agreement.4 In absolutive as morphological default languages, if the inherent case-marked A may trigger agreement, both A (ergative) and S (nominative, realized morphologically by absolutive) will trigger subject agreement. O may either trigger no agreement, or may trigger distinct object agreement. This A/S subject agreement pattern is found in Warlpiri and Enga. In Warlpiri, A and S trigger subject agreement, and O triggers distinct object agreement:

3 Although when the object of a benefactive or comitative preposition is a proper name, the absolutive is zero. This seems phonologically motivated for benefactives, although not for comitatives.
4 In fact, the variation is more fine-grained in that different inherent cases may behave differently in a single language.
(16) a. Ngajulu-rlu *-rna ngku nyuntu nya-ngu
   I-ERG-1sg.SUBJ-2sg.OBJ you.ABS see-NPAST
   “I saw you”

b. Ngaju *-rna
   I.ABS-1sg.SUBJ run-PAST
   “I ran”

c. Nyuntu-rlu-ju ngaju nga ngku
   you-ERG-2sgNOM-1sgOBJ I.ABS see-NPAST
   “You saw me”

In Enga, A and S trigger subject agreement; O does not trigger agreement:

(17) a. namba-mé énda dáko mená dáko mái-y-ô
   I-ERG woman DET.ABS pig DET.ABS give-PAST-1sg.SUBJ
   “I gave the pig to the woman” (L&L 312)

b. nambá p-ê-ô
   I.ABS go-PAST-1sg.SUBJ
   “I went” (L&L 317)

c. akáli doko-mé mená dáko namba-nyá sambe-k-ê-á
   man DET-ERG pig DET.ABS I-BEN buy-BEN.INCL-PAST-3sg.SUBJ
   “The man bought the pig for me.” (L&L 312)

In a morphological default language in which the inherent case marked A may not trigger agreement, only S triggers subject agreement. This pattern is found in Niuean: 5

(18) a. Nofo *-agaia nakai e matua fifine haau i Mutalau?
   live still Q ABS parent female your in Mutalau
   “Does your mother still live in Mutalau (village)?”

b. No-nofo *-agaia nakai e tau ma-matua haau i Mutalau?
   PL-live still Q ABS PL.PL -parent your in Mutalau
   “Do your parents still live in Mutalau (village)?” (S 62)

(19) a. Moua oti e maua mo Sione e tau mata afi
   get all ERG we.DUAL.EXCL with Sione ABS PL piece fire
   “Sione and I have already won all the matches” (S 67)

b. V olu *-naki he tau fânau e fua niu?
   grater Q ERG PL children ABS fruit coconut
   “Are the children grating (the fruit of the) coconut?” (S 70)

In absolutive as nominative languages, if the inherent case marked A cannot trigger agreement, “absolutive agreement” results, subject agreement triggered by S and O. If the inherent case marked A can trigger subject agreement, then T enters into two relationships in a transitive clause, one with A and one with O (which it assigns nominative case). Georgian is of this latter type, T agreeing with both A and O. The A and O features compete for morphological realization across a prefix and suffix position (for discussion see e.g. Anderson 1992, Halle & Marantz 1993, Stump 2001; also McGinnis 2001, Trommer 2002).

5The agreement facts in Niuean are complicated by the existence of lexical exceptions; Seiter (1980) reports two verbs that allow agreement with A, and a small class of verbs that allow agreement with O (he provides two). See that work for details.
“draw” aorist

\[
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
\text{Obj} & 1sg & 1pl & 2sg & 2pl & 3
\hline
1sg & - & - & g-xat’e & g-xat’e-t & v-xat’e
1pl & - & - & g-xat’e-t & g-xat’e-t & v-xat’e-t
2sg & m-xat’e & gv-xat’e & - & - & ø-xat’e
2pl & m-xat’e-t & gv-xat’e-t & - & - & ø-xat’e-t
3sg & m-xat’a & gv-xat’a & g-xat’a & g-xat’a-t & xat’ava
3pl & m-xat’-es & gv-xat’-es & g-xat’-es & g-xat’-es & xat’av-es
\end{array}
\]

Notice, for example, that the prefix position realizes object agreement features of 1st and 2nd person objects, but subject agreement features with 3rd person objects. A preliminary analysis of these agreement morphemes follows: 1pl Obj ↔ gv-, 1sg Obj ↔ m-, 2 Subj ↔ ø-, 2 Obj ↔ g-, 1 Subj ↔ v-, 3plSubj ↔ -es, pl ↔ -t.

3. Split Ergativity in Pama-Nyungan

Pama-Nyungan languages commonly show split ergativity based on nominal-type; thus certain nominals inflect according to an ergative-absolutive pattern, while others show a nominative-accusative pattern. I claim that abstract case assignment is uniformly ergative on A, nominative on S, and accusative on O; only the morphological realization of these abstract cases varies across nominal types.

In Djapu (Pama-Nyungan, Yuulngu; data from Morphy 1983), human and higher animates inflect on an ergative-nominative-accusative pattern, pronouns inflect on a nominative-accusative pattern, and other nominals inflect on an ergative-absolutive pattern, including wh-words (except yol “who”), determiners/demonstratives, lower animates, and inanimates. All elements of a DP, whether continuous or discontinuous, must be marked for case, and these must all match in case.

(21) a. rdaykun-garri-nyara-y nganapurr ganggathi-rr-ny ngula-ngur
sun-enter-NMLSR-TEMP we.EXCL.NOM get.up.and.go-UNM-PRO there-ABL
Gurrumuru-ngur
Gurrumuru-ABL
glt “We left Gurrumuru at sunset” (39)

b. bala ngayi ga:rr-i-nya-mara-m birrka’mirr rdung’rtung
then he.NOM enter-NMLSR-CAUS-UNM anything.ABS palpitating.ABS
ngurikal-yi yolngu-wal
that.OBL-ANAPH person-OBL
“Then he puts some other palpitating thing into that person” (40)

c. djamarrkurli’ Milyin-gu nhina’nhina ngunya gal’-ngur
children.ABS Milyin-DAT sit-REDUP.UNM that.LOC side-LOC
“Milyin’s children are sitting over there” (43)

However, the combination of a demonstrative (ergative-absolutive), and a human noun (ergative-nominative-accusative) results in case mismatches:

(22) a. wungay’ marrtji-nya ngunhi-ny-dhi yolngu-n
honey.ABS go-PAST.NONINDIC that.ABS-PRO-ANAPH person-ACC
wapirti warrtju-na-puyngu-nha-ny weka-nha
stingray-spear.PL-NMLSR-INHAB-ACC-PRO give-PAST.NONINDIC
“We would go and give honey to those people who were spearing stingrays [lit ‘to those stingray-spearing people’]” (Morphy 1983:110)

b. ngayi ngunhi nganya nguli buthuwa-ny ngunhi-yi
he.NOM THAT him.ACC IRREAL give.birth.to.UNM-PRO that.ABS-ANAPH
yutjuwala-n small-ACC
“...when it gives birth to the small one” (129)
Thus, ngunhi-ny-dihi yolngu-n “that person”, for example, illustrates absolutive as a morphological default for a subsection of the Djaí grammar: the demonstratives. For the realization of “person [Accusative]”, the morphology provides a case-invariant realization of “person” yolngu, and an accusative suffix for human nouns -nha (which contrasts with for example the ergative -duh, the dative -gu, and the ablative -galngur). For the realization of “that [Accusative]”, the morphology provides no accusative form (although it does provide for example an ergative form nguringi, a dative form nguriki, and an ablative form ngurikalangungur). Thus, the morphological default (“absolutive”) ngunhi is inserted.

Similar data obtains in Kugu Ngnahcara (Pama-Nyungan, Middle Paman, Smith & Johnson 2000), and Margany (Pama-Nyungan, Maric, Breen 1981). These differ from Djaí in that no nominal type has morphological realizations for all three of ergative-nominative-accusative. However, case mismatches again indicate that all three are indeed assigned. These case mismatches result from the combination of pronouns, which inflect on a nominative-accusative paradigm, and nouns/adjectives/demonstratives, which inflect on an ergative-absolutive paradigm.

(23) **Case Mismatches in Kugu Ngnahcara**

a. nhi-la pukpe-ng nhu-nha kuyu yuku muka-ng-nha peka
   3sg-NOM child-ERG 3sg-ACC woman.ABS thing stone-ERG-3sgACC throw.at
   “The child threw a stone at the woman” (390)

b. nhi-la pama-ng nhi-ngu pukpe-wu ku’a waa-ngu
   3sg-NOM man-ERG 3sg-DAT child-DAT dog give-3sgDAT
   “The man gave a dog to the child” (401)

(24) **Case Mismatches in Margany**

a. matya ngaya balga-nganda-la yurdy, nhanga-nggu
   before 1sg.NOM hit-HAB-PAST meat/animal.ABS young-ERG
   “I used to kill alot of kangaroos when I was young” (307, 336)

b. gurruny-duy ngaya dhumba-nhi
   alone-ERG 1sg.NOM build-RecPast
   “I built it on my own” (342)

c. nhuwa nhula dhana-li-nhi gubaguba, wawungga
   that.ABS 3sg.NOM stand-PROX-PRES old.man.ABS behind.ABS
   “That man behind us is very old” (321)

4. **Locus**

Finally, I would like to consider the locus of the distinction between absolutive as nominative languages and absolutive as morphological default languages. I propose that the distinction be placed within the lexical entries of the v head that introduces the external argument (cf Bowers 1993 PredP, Chomsky 1995, Collins 1997 TrP, Kratzer 1996 VoiceP, Marantz 2001). Absolutive as morphological default languages exhibit two v: (i) $v_{TRANS}$—assigns a $\theta$-role to the thematic subject, assigns inherent Ergative case to the thematic subject, licenses structural accusative case, and combines with a transitive verb; (ii) $v_{INTRANS}$—assigns a $\theta$-role to the thematic subject, and combines with an intransitive verb. Absolutive as nominative languages have the same $v_{INTRANS}$, but their $v_{TRANS}$ is different in that it does not license structural accusative case. Georgian exhibits an additional $v_{TRANS}$ used in tense/aspect series I, which assigns a $\theta$-role to the thematic subject, licenses structural dative case, and combines with a transitive verb.

5. **Conclusion**
In this paper, I have argued that ergative-absolutive languages be classified into two distinct classes, one in which absolutive corresponds to structural nominative, and the other in which absolutive is a morphological default disguising structural nominative on S and structural accusative on O. One result of this analysis is that absolutive as an abstract case may be eliminated. More crucially, the analysis of absolutive as morphological default languages requires the existence of both morphological and abstract case, and requires that morphological case be an imperfect realization of abstract case, this realization dependent on the morphological resources of the language.
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